

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450' Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/255,777	02/23/1999	SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI	0756-1936	9041
75	590 · 10/23/2003	·	EXAM	MINER
SIXBEY FRIEDMAN LEEDOM & FERGUSON PC			BOOTH, RICHARD A	
8180 GREENS	BORO DRIVE			
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA	22102	. •	2812	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/255,777	YAMAZAKI ET AL.	•
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard A. Booth	2812	MW
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the control of	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		•
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, the period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the scalculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ I 36(a) and the appropriate exite fee. The appropriate exite final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		•
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I		•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finálly rejected clair	ms.
NOTE:	•		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:	•		•
Claim(s) objected to:	•		
Claim(s) rejected:		,	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Exam	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	 •	• .
10. Other:		11/	
		Richard A. Booth Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2812	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: in response to applicant's argument that neither Yamazaki or Mukai disclose wherein at least channel formation region is crystallized by irradiation through an insulating film. However, Yamazaki discloses the crystallization of at least a portion of a channel region (see fig. 5G) and Mukai discloses the crystallization of a

region through an insulation film. Therefore, it is the combination of the two references that discloses this claimed limitation.